UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/686,369	10/15/2003	Craig C. Klocke	P06629US0-5195	6717	
	34082 7590 06/01/2009 ZARLEY LAW FIRM P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
CAPITAL SQUARE			WEINSTEIN, LEONARD J		
400 LOCUST, SUITE 200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3746		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/01/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,369	KLOCKE, CRAIG C.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEONARD J. WEINSTEIN	3746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tird will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 S This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-16 and 19-21 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6,10-13,15,16,19 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7-9,14 and 21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	and 20 is/are withdrawn from cons	sideration.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the defended or b) for objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/686,369 Page 2

Art Unit: 3746

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment of September 29, 2008. In making the below rejections and/or objections the examiner has considered and addressed each of the applicant's arguments.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 21 is listed as "new" however it was presented in the response filed May 20, 2008. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. Claims 7-9, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Du US 2002/0176784, as evidenced Du et al. US 6,375,433, in view of Kawaguchi et al. US 6,126,405. Du '784 teaches all the limitations as claimed for a

Application/Control Number: 10/686,369

Art Unit: 3746

Page 3

method of controlling the angle of a swashplate 104 of a hydrostatic unit (as shown in figure 1) including: **[claim 7]** the step of the method of

- a. 602, 604, 606, 608 generating an electric signal based on a set point signal (α),
- b. 610 receiving the electric signal, via 318, 320, 322, in a microprocessor 324, interpolating the information from the electric signal using an algorithm contained (Eq. 1 after ¶0031 and Eq.2 after ¶0039) in the microprocessor 324, sending an output signal from the microprocessor 324 to a pressure control 302, and generating a pressure signal (\dot{P}_c) in the pressure control 302, determining a slew rate ($\dot{\alpha}_d$ as evidenced by Du '433 in column 5 line 34 where $\dot{\alpha}$ is the angular velocity of the swashplate) of the swashplate 104 based on the pressure signal, and
- c. 612 displacing the swashplate (¶0038);

Du '784 further teaches the method including: **[claim 8]** a set point signal is generated by measuring an operational parameter (α); **[claim 9]** the step wherein the operational parameter is the angle (α) of the swashplate 104; **[claim 14]** the step including a pressure control 302 is a pilot valve with one boost spool 308 (¶0019); **[claim 21]** and the step of the method of (602) receiving a feed back signal, via element 320, within the microprocessor 324 that is dependent on an angle (α) of the swashplate 104.

Du '784 fails to teach the following limitation of a method including sending an output signal that is superimposed with a dither signal. Du teaches a pressure control

302 that is an electro-hydraulic valve controlled by an electrical signal (90019). Kawaguchi teaches that a known electro-hydraulic valve used for controlling the displacement of a variable displacement compressor uses a valve body similar to a spool (67, 75, 83), displaced by a solenoid 87 that is controlled by dither controller 93. The dither controller 93 actuates the solenoid 87 to move a valve body 67 and the degree to which the valve body 67 moves results in a valve hole that either fully opens, increases in size but is not fully open, or closes. Kawaguchi teaches a dither controller 93 that increases or decreases a target current value for solenoid 87 in response to a cooling load on the compressor which in turn affects a biasing force on a valve body 67. The dither controller sets a target current and a computer 57 commands a driver 88 to transmit an undulating current to a coil 87 of a solenoid (Kawaguchi – col. 9 ll. 11-15; 26-36). Based on the target current value, the valve body 67 will be displaced a corresponding distance that will result in a valve hole 68 opening that is either increased or decreased in size. The size of the opening 68 affects the amount of gas flow from a discharge chamber 38 to a crank chamber 15, which in turn determines the angle of the swash plate 22 and the displacement of the compressor.

Kawaguchi teaches a method using a dithering controller 93 for moving a valve body, similar to a spool valve, using a solenoid in order to change the angle of swash plate of a variable displacement compressor. Kawaguchi teaches varying the position of a valve body so that the swashplate is moved to intermediate angle positions that correspond to a current cooling demand; more than just angles that correspond to the maximum and minimum displacement of the compressor. (Kawaguchi – fig. 1; col. 9 ll. 8

Art Unit: 3746

- col. 10 II. 33; col. 10 II. 62 - col. 11 II. 10). The position of the valve body of Kawaguchi corresponds with the position X_{ν} that is determined by the microprocessor 324 of Du for a spool valve in control block 610. Du calculates a desired position so that a spool valve will be moved to a desired position in order to produce a responsive movement of a swash plate for a variable displacement compressor to a desired angle position α_{d} (Du '784 - ¶0038, 0040, 0047). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a control for a variable displacement compressor including a microprocessor which determines a desired position for a electrohydraulic servo-valve, as taught by Du, modified to incorporate a dither control which controls a target current for a solenoid which results in a valve body positioned in a specific location, as taught by Kawaguchi, in order to accurately control the displacement of a compressor, reduce consumption of power, and reduce the size of a control valve (Kawaguchi - col. 2 II. 41-48).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed Sep9, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Du US 2002/0176784, as evidenced Du et al. US 6,375,433, in view of Kawaguchi et al. US 6,126,405.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEONARD J. WEINSTEIN whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 10/686,369 Page 6

Art Unit: 3746

(571)272-9961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 -

5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Devon Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-7118. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Devon C Kramer/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art

Unit 3746

/Leonard J Weinstein/ Examiner, Art Unit 3746